REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

The rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is respectfully traversed. It is perfectly evident from various statements in the specification and from the drawings that the rough adhesive material contact surfaces occupy the entirety of the opposite sides of the disk-shaped object. For example, the third paragraph of the BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION on page 2 of the specification states:

> "According to the invention, contact surfaces provided on opposite sides of a disk-shaped object of synthetic thermoplastic material are made rough."

The next paragraph on page 2 states:

> "By a process according to the invention, suitable roughness of the contact surfaces is generated in the forming of the objects."

The last paragraph on page 3 states:

> "In one embodiment according to the invention, an object 1 shown in Fig. 1 is in the form of a circular disk having two parallel circular faces, forming contact surfaces 2,3."

The second paragraph on page 5 of the specification states:

> "In order to generate the rough texture of the contact surfaces 2, 3 during the actual production of an object 1, the matching molding surfaces 15, 16 of the tool halves 11, 13 are provided with a rough surface of corresponding roughness depth."

It is fully apparent that the rough adhesive material contact surfaces occupy the entirety of the opposite sides of the disk-shaped object. Nevertheless, if the Office prefers that the specification be amended to include the foregoing statement in exactly those words, Applicant will certainly comply.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakaki et al. (6,090,463) in view of secondary references is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites a disk-shaped object of synthetic thermoplastic adhesive material that has adhesive material contact surfaces on opposite sides of the object that are rough, wherein their averaged roughness depth R_z lies in a range from 40-100μ.

Sakaki et al. disclose a cleaning sheet with localized adhesive regions 21 provided on one surface of a base material, the opposite surface of which has a specific surface roughness. Sakaki et al. state:

> "The greatest feature of the cleaning sheet according to the present invention resides in that the above-described region 21 having an adhesive property is provided on one surface of the base material, at the same time the surface opposite to the surface having the adhesive region is a surface having a specific surface roughness, as shown in FIG. 3B." (Column 6, lines 34-39)

Clearly, the reference does not teach or suggest a disk-shaped object of synthetic thermoplastic adhesive material having adhesive material contact surfaces on opposite sides of the object that have the roughness specified in Claim 1.

Contrary to the assertion in the rejection based on Sakaki et al., in the reference there are no contact surfaces on opposite sides of an object of synthetic thermoplastic adhesive material that are rough, and there is no teaching or suggestion of such contact surfaces that occupy the entirety of the opposite sides of an object, disk-shaped or otherwise.

Contrary to the assertion in the rejection based on Sakaki et al., no one of ordinary skill in the art would have any reason to modify the cleaning sheet of Sakaki et al. to produce the disk-shaped object recited in independent Claim 1, or in dependent Claims 2 and 7. The disk-shaped

object recited in Claim 1 is not a mere matter of design choice that would be obvious from Sakaki et al. in view of the secondary references relied on.

The fact that there may be disk-shaped adhesive in an orthodontic appliance (Jacobs et al.), a thermo neck wrap (Burkett et al.) or an acupressure patch (Chang) is not a reasonable basis for any modification of the cleaning sheet of Sakaki et al. that would produce the disk-shaped object recited in Claim 1, which has contact surfaces on opposite sides of the object that have specified roughness.

The disk-shaped object recited in Claim 1 is clearly structurally different from any reasonable combination of the secondary references with Sakaki et al., and while the phrase "for use as an intermediate between parts" may not in itself be considered sufficient to distinguish patentably from the references, the fact that the disk-shaped object recited in Claim 1 has a specific construction cannot properly be ignored in considering the appropriateness of combining references.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itada et al. (6,638,602) in view of the same secondary references referred to earlier is respectfully traversed.

Itada et al. disclose a multi-layer adhesive wrapping film. There is no teaching or suggestion of a disk-shaped object of synthetic thermoplastic adhesive material having adhesive material contact surfaces on opposite sides of the object that have a specified roughness, as recited in independent Claim 1. Nor is there any teaching or suggestion in Itada et al. of such an object in which the rough adhesive material contact surfaces occupy the entirety of the opposite sides of the object, as recited in Claim 7.

There is no reasonable basis for combining the diverse teachings of the secondary references with the multi-layer adhesive wrapping film of Itada et al. in any manner that would produce the invention recited in the rejected claims.

The rejection of Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itada et al. further in view of Mascarenhas et al. (5,888,615) is respectfully traversed.

This rejection acknowledges that Itada fails to disclose the arithmetic mean roughness R_a lying in the range specified in Claims 3 and 4 and proposes to cure the deficiency by incorporating teachings of Mascarenhas et al.

Mascarenhas et al. disclose cling films and articles in which an upper surface of a first layer is smooth. See, e.g., column 11, lines 9-10. This teaching has nothing

whatever to do with a disk-shaped object in which adhesive material contact surfaces on opposite sides of the object have a specified arithmetic mean rugosity in particular ranges.

The claimed invention is not concerned with adhesive wrapping film or cling films and articles, but is limited to a disk-shaped object having a particular structure recited in the claims. The deficiencies of Itada *vis-à-vis* Applicant's invention, are not cured by any teachings of Mascarenhas.

Claims 8-11 have been added to provide more comprehensive protection for the invention.

New Claim 8 recites a disk-shaped object of synthetic thermoplastic adhesive material, wherein adhesive material contact surfaces that entirely cover opposite sides of the object are rough. The claim then specifies a particular range of averaged roughness depth and a particular range of arithmetic mean rugosity. Nowhere in the prior art is there any teaching or suggestion of the disk-shaped object recited in Claim 8.

New Claims 9-11 are even more specific. Claim 9 recites a disk-shaped object having the structure shown in Fig. 1, for example. Claims 10 and 11 recite a disk-shaped object employed as shown in Fig. 3, for example. Nowhere in

the prior art is there any teaching or suggestion of the inventions recited in Claims 9-11.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be clearly in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (A-10035) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Nelson H. Shapiro

Nelson H. Shapiro
Reg. No. 17,095

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive
Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
(703) 903-9000

May 18, 2007

NHS:kss